JS 44 (Rev. 10/20)

Case 5:22-cv-01598 Thu Decorporate 1/51Files 104/25/22 Page 1 of 14

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS			DEFENDANTS						
Angel Nazario				Nationwide Property and Casualty Insurance Company					
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff Franklin County (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)				County of Residence of First Listed Defendant Franklin County, OH (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY)					
				NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED.					
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, A Simon & Simon, PC	Address, and Telephone Number)		Attorneys (If Known)					
18 Campus Blvd., Su									
Newtown Square, PA		1		NACHAR OF B	DINI	CIDAL DADELEG			
II. BASIS OF JURISDI	ICTION (Place an "X" in C	One Box Only)		TIZENSHIP OF P (For Diversity Cases Only)	ZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES (Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff or Diversity Cases Only) and One Box for Defendant)				
U.S. Government Plaintiff			Citize		TF [] 1	DEF 1 Incorporated or Pri of Business In T		PTF 4	DEF 4
2 U.S. Government Defendant	x 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)		Citize	n of Another State	2	2 Incorporated <i>and</i> P of Business In A		5	X 5
				n or Subject of a eign Country	3	3 Foreign Nation		<u> </u>	6
IV. NATURE OF SUIT			FO		Click	here for: Nature of S			
CONTRACT 110 Insurance	TOF PERSONAL INJURY	PERSONAL INJURY		FREITURE/PENALTY 5 Drug Related Seizure	\Box	BANKRUPTCY 122 Appeal 28 USC 158	375 False C	STATUT	
110 Insurance 120 Marine 130 Miller Act 140 Negotiable Instrument 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment 151 Medicare Act 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excludes Veterans) 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits 160 Stockholders' Suits 190 Other Contract 195 Contract Product Liability 196 Franchise REAL PROPERTY 210 Land Condemnation 220 Foreclosure 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment 240 Torts to Land 245 Tort Product Liability 290 All Other Real Property	PERSONAL INJURY 310 Airplane 315 Airplane Product Liability 320 Assault, Libel & Slander 330 Federal Employers' Liability 340 Marine 345 Marine Product Liability × 350 Motor Vehicle 355 Motor Vehicle Product Liability 360 Other Personal Injury 362 Personal Injury - Medical Malpractice CIVIL RIGHTS 440 Other Civil Rights 441 Voting 442 Employment 443 Housing/ Accommodations 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - Employment 446 Amer. w/Disabilities - Other 448 Education	PERSONAL INJURY 365 Personal Injury - Product Liability 367 Health Care/ Pharmaceutical Personal Injury Product Liability 368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability PERSONAL PROPERI 370 Other Fraud 371 Truth in Lending 380 Other Personal Property Damage 385 Property Damage 385 Property Damage Product Liability PRISONER PETITION Habeas Corpus: 463 Alien Detainee 510 Motions to Vacate Sentence 530 General 535 Death Penalty Other: 540 Mandamus & Othe 550 Civil Rights 555 Prison Condition 560 Civil Detainee -	74/ 75 8 79/ 46.	LABOR O Fair Labor Standards Act O Labor/Management Relations O Railway Labor Act Family and Medical Leave Act O Other Labor Litigation Employee Retirement Income Security Act IMMIGRATION Naturalization Application Other Immigration Cother Immigration Cother Immigration Cother Immigration Cother Immigration Cother Immigration	4	22 Appeal 28 USC 158 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157 ROPERTY RIGHTS 420 Copyrights 430 Patent 435 Patent - Abbreviated New Drug Application 436 Trademark 4380 Defend Trade Secrets Act of 2016 SOCIAL SECURITY 4361 HIA (1395ff) 4362 Black Lung (923) 4363 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)) 4364 SSID Title XVI 4365 RSI (405(g)) EDERAL TAX SUITS 4370 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant) 4371 IRS—Third Party 26 USC 7609	376 Qui Tar 3729(a 400 State R 410 Antitru 430 Banks a 450 Comme 460 Deporta 470 Rackete Corrupt 480 Consum (15 US 485 Telephe Protect 490 Cable/S 850 Securit Exchar 890 Other S 891 Agricul 893 Envirod Act 896 Arbitra 899 Admini Act/Rev	m (31 USC))) eapportion st and Bankin erce ation eer Influen to Organiza ner Credit iC 1681 or one Consu cion Act Sat TV ies/Comm age statutory A ltural Acts thural Acts thu	nnment nng nneed and attions tr 1692) nmer nodities/ Actions s Matters mation rrocedure ppeal of
W. ODIGDI		Conditions of Confinement							
V. ORIGIN (Place an "X" in x 1 Original 2 Ren	1 C 2 D	Lemanded from	14 Reins	stated or 5 Transfe	erred f	rom 🖂 6 Multidistri	ct \square 8	Multidis	strict
Proceeding Stat	te Court A	Appellate Court	Reop	ened Anothe	er Distr y)	rict Litigation - Transfer		Litigatio Direct F	on -
VI CAUSE OF ACTIO	28 LLS C. 8 1391(b) (1)		e filing (L	o not cite jurisdictional sta	itutes ui	nless diversity):			
VI. CAUSE OF ACTIO	Brief description of cau Motor Vehicle Accident	ise:							
VII. REQUESTED IN CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION DEMAND \$ CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint: UNDER RULE 23, F.R.Cv.P. JURY DEMAND: Yes No									
VIII. RELATED CASE(S) IF ANY (See instructions): JUDGE DOCKET NUMBER									
DATE SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD									
04/25/2022 Marc Simon									
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY RECEIPT # AM	40UNT	APPLYING IFP		JUDGE		MAG. JUD	OGE		

Case 5:22-cv-01598 Linited Squares on strict of Pennsylvania Page 2 of 14 For the Eastern district of Pennsylvania

DESIGNATION FORM(to be used by counsel or pro se plaintiff to indicate the category of the case for the purpose of assignment to the appropriate calendar)

Address of Plaintiff: Angel Nazario - 62 Edgewater Dr., Chambersburg, PA 17202					
Address of Defendant: Nationwide - One Nationwide Plaza, Columbus, OH 43215					
Place of Accident, Incident or Transaction: intersection of N Front St. & Windsor St., in Reading, PA					
,					
RELATED CASE, IF ANY:					
Case Number: J	udge: [Date Terminated:			
Civil cases are deemed related when Yes is answered to	any of the following questions:				
1. Is this case related to property included in an earlier numbered suit pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court?					
2. Does this case involve the same issue of fact or grow out of the same transaction as a prior suit yes No very pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court?					
3. Does this case involve the validity or infringement of a patent already in suit or any earlier numbered case pending or within one year previously terminated action of this court?					
4. Is this case a second or successive habeas corpus, social security appeal, or pro se civil rights Yes No Verification of the same individual?					
I certify that, to my knowledge, the within case this court except as noted above. DATE: 04/25/2022 **Matter signature** **Matter signature** **Attorney-at-Law/Pro Se Plaintiff** **Attorney I.D. # (if applicable)**					
CIVIL: (Place a √in one category only)					
CIVIL: (Place a √ in one category only) A. Federal Question Cases:	B. Diversity Jurisdiction Case	es:			
	Other Contracts 1. Insurance Contract 2. Airplane Personal I 3. Assault, Defamatio 4. Marine Personal In 5. Motor Vehicle Pers 6. Other Personal Inj 7. Products Liability 8. Products Liability 9. All other Diversity (Please specify):	and Other Contracts Injury on tjury sonal Injury ary (Please specify):			
A. Federal Question Cases: 1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All 2. FELA 3. Jones Act-Personal Injury 4. Antitrust 5. Patent 6. Labor-Management Relations 7. Civil Rights 8. Habeas Corpus 9. Securities Act(s) Cases 10. Social Security Review Cases 11. All other Federal Question Cases (Please specify):	Other Contracts 1. Insurance Contract 2. Airplane Personal I 3. Assault, Defamatio 4. Marine Personal In 5. Motor Vehicle Pers 6. Other Personal Inj 7. Products Liability 8. Products Liability 9. All other Diversity (Please specify):	and Other Contracts Injury on ijury sonal Injury Iry (Please specify): — Asbestos Cases			
A. Federal Question Cases: 1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All 2. FELA 3. Jones Act-Personal Injury 4. Antitrust 5. Patent 6. Labor-Management Relations 7. Civil Rights 8. Habeas Corpus 9. Securities Act(s) Cases 10. Social Security Review Cases 11. All other Federal Question Cases (Please specify): (The effect of the Marc Simon)	Other Contracts 1. Insurance Contract 2. Airplane Personal I 3. Assault, Defamatio 4. Marine Personal In 5. Motor Vehicle Pers 6. Other Personal Inj 7. Products Liability 8. Products Liability 9. All other Diversity (Please specify):	and Other Contracts Injury on ijury sonal Injury Iry (Please specify): — Asbestos Cases			
A. Federal Question Cases: 1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All 2. FELA 3. Jones Act-Personal Injury 4. Antitrust 5. Patent 6. Labor-Management Relations 7. Civil Rights 8. Habeas Corpus 9. Securities Act(s) Cases 10. Social Security Review Cases 11. All other Federal Question Cases (Please specify): (The effect of the contract of the	Other Contracts 1. Insurance Contract 2. Airplane Personal I 3. Assault, Defamatio 4. Marine Personal In 5. Motor Vehicle Pers 6. Other Personal Inj 7. Products Liability 8. Products Liability 9. All other Diversity (Please specify): ARBITRATION CERTIFICATION his certification is to remove the case from eligibility for sel of record or pro se plaintiff, do hereby certify: hat to the best of my knowledge and belief, the dam	and Other Contracts Injury on ijury sonal Injury ary (Please specify): - Asbestos Cases			
A. Federal Question Cases: 1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All 2. FELA 3. Jones Act-Personal Injury 4. Antitrust 5. Patent 6. Labor-Management Relations 7. Civil Rights 8. Habeas Corpus 9. Securities Act(s) Cases 10. Social Security Review Cases 11. All other Federal Question Cases (Please specify): (The effect of the Image of	Other Contracts 1. Insurance Contract 2. Airplane Personal In 3. Assault, Defamatio 4. Marine Personal In 5. Motor Vehicle Pers 6. Other Personal Inj 7. Products Liability 8. Products Liability 9. All other Diversity (Please specify): ARBITRATION CERTIFICATION this certification is to remove the case from eligibility for sel of record or pro se plaintiff, do hereby certify: that to the best of my knowledge and belief, the dam terest and costs:	and Other Contracts Injury on ijury sonal Injury ary (Please specify): - Asbestos Cases			
A. Federal Question Cases: 1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All 2. FELA 3. Jones Act-Personal Injury 4. Antitrust 5. Patent 6. Labor-Management Relations 7. Civil Rights 8. Habeas Corpus 9. Securities Act(s) Cases 10. Social Security Review Cases 11. All other Federal Question Cases (Please specify): (The effect of to the sum of \$150,000.00 exclusive of integral in the sum of \$150,000.00 exclusive of \$150,000.00 exclusive of \$150,000.00 exclusiv	Other Contracts 1. Insurance Contract 2. Airplane Personal In 3. Assault, Defamatio 4. Marine Personal In 5. Motor Vehicle Pers 6. Other Personal Inj 7. Products Liability 8. Products Liability 9. All other Diversity (Please specify): ARBITRATION CERTIFICATION this certification is to remove the case from eligibility for sel of record or pro se plaintiff, do hereby certify: that to the best of my knowledge and belief, the dam terest and costs:	and Other Contracts Injury on ijury sonal Injury ary (Please specify): - Asbestos Cases			
A. Federal Question Cases: 1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All 2. FELA 3. Jones Act-Personal Injury 4. Antitrust 5. Patent 6. Labor-Management Relations 7. Civil Rights 8. Habeas Corpus 9. Securities Act(s) Cases 10. Social Security Review Cases 11. All other Federal Question Cases (Please specify): (The effect of to exceed the sum of \$150,000.00 exclusive of in Relief other than monetary damages is sought.	Other Contracts 1. Insurance Contract 2. Airplane Personal I 3. Assault, Defamatio 4. Marine Personal In 5. Motor Vehicle Pers 6. Other Personal Inj 7. Products Liability 8. Products Liability 9. All other Diversity (Please specify): ARBITRATION CERTIFICATION his certification is to remove the case from eligibility for sel of record or pro se plaintiff, do hereby certify: hat to the best of my knowledge and belief, the dam terest and costs: Marine Personal In 9. All other Diversity (Please specify):	and Other Contracts Injury on ijury sonal Injury ary (Please specify): - Asbestos Cases - arbitration.)			

Case 5:22-cv-01598-JFL Document 1 Filed 04/25/22 Page 3 of 14

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

CASE MANAGEMENT TRACK DESIGNATION FORM

Telephone	FAX Numb	er	E-Mail Address	
215-467-4666	267-639-90	06	MarcSimon@gosimon.co	om_
Date	Attorney-at	-law	Attorney for	
04/25/2022	Marc Simon		Angel Nazario	
(f) Standard Management –	Cases that do not	fall into an	y one of the other tracks.	(X)
(e) Special Management – C commonly referred to as the court. (See reverse si management cases.)	complex and that	need speci	al or intense management by	()
(d) Asbestos – Cases involvi exposure to asbestos.	ng claims for pers	sonal injury	or property damage from	()
(c) Arbitration – Cases requi	red to be designat	ed for arbit	ration under Local Civil Rule 53.2.	()
(b) Social Security – Cases reand Human Services den				()
a) Habeas Corpus – Cases brought under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 through § 2255.				
SELECT ONE OF THE FO	OLLOWING CAS	SE MANA	GEMENT TRACKS:	
plaintiff shall complete a Cas filing the complaint and serve side of this form.) In the e designation, that defendant sl	se Management To e a copy on all defe- vent that a defendable, with its first ties, a Case Mana	rack Designendants. (So dant does nappearance gement Tra	Reduction Plan of this court, counse nation Form in all civil cases at the time § 1:03 of the plan set forth on the rest of agree with the plaintiff regarding, submit to the clerk of court and serick Designation Form specifying the ned.	me of verse said ve on
Nationwide Property and Ca Company,	sualty Insurance	: :	NO.	
Angel Nazario v.		:	CIVIL ACTION	
A 1 NJ			CIVII ACTION	

(Civ. 660) 10/02

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

Angel Nazario		:	
62 Edgewater Dr.			#
Chambersburg, PA 17202		:	
_	Plaintiff	:	
v.		:	
		•	
Nationwide Property and Ca	asualty Insuranc	e:	
Company		:	
One Nationwide Plaza		:	
Columbus, OH 43215		:	
	Defendant	-	

COMPLAINT

PARTIES

- 1. Plaintiff, Angel Nazario ("Plaintiff"), is a resident of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, residing at the address listed in the caption of this Complaint.
- 2. Defendant, Nationwide Property and Casualty Insurance Company ("Defendant" or "Nationwide"), was at all times material hereto, an insurance company incorporated in the State of Ohio, with a principal place of business at the address listed in the caption of this Complaint.
- 3. At all relevant times, Defendant was engaged in the practice of providing automobile insurance policies, including, but not limited to, motor vehicle liability policies. These policies occasionally provide underinsured (UIM) and uninsured (UM) motorist coverage.
- 4. Pursuant to Rule 38 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Plaintiff demands trial by jury in this action of all issues so triable.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

5. This Court has diversity jurisdiction over the parties and subject matter in this civil action because Plaintiff is a citizen of Pennsylvania, Defendant is a corporate citizen of Ohio, and the amount in controversy in this case, exclusive of interest and costs, exceeds the sum of \$75,000.

- 6. Venue is proper in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) (1) and (2), in that a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to the claims asserted in this Complaint occurred in this judicial district, including Defendant's issuance of an insurance policy providing the UIM benefits disputed herein.
- 7. More specifically, this matter involves a dispute over UIM benefits applicable to Plaintiff under a policy of insurance issued by Defendant to Plaintiff in Reading, Berks County, Pennsylvania, which is located in this judicial district.

FACTS

- 8. On or about February 16, 2020, at approximately 6:00 p.m., Plaintiff was the owner and operator of a motor vehicle proceeding on North Front Street, in Reading, PA, proceeding straight through a green light controlling the intersection with Windsor Street.
- 9. At the same date and time, Yajarlyn Maria-Reyes (the "tortfeasor"), was the owner and operator of a motor vehicle proceeding on Windsor Street, approaching the same intersection.
- 10. Despite having a red light requiring her to stop, the tortfeasor disregarded and disobeyed the red light and plowed straight through the intersection, crashing into Plaintiff's vehicle.
 - 11. This collision was not the result of any action or failure to act by Plaintiff.
- 12. Rather, the negligence or carelessness of the tortfeasor was the sole proximate cause of the red light crash, and of the resulting injuries and damages sustained by Plaintiff, and it consisted of, but was not limited to, the following:
 - a. Striking Plaintiff's vehicle after running a red traffic signal;
 - b. Failing to exercise ordinary care to avoid the subject red light crash;
 - c. Operating their vehicle without regard for the rights or safety of Plaintiff or the general motoring public, and in such a manner as to cause the subject red light crash;

2

- d. Failing to keep a proper lookout for approaching vehicular traffic before and while running through a red traffic signal;
- e. Failing to adequately, sufficiently, and properly clear traffic to ensure it was safe to proceed before and while running through a red traffic signal;
- f. Failing to yield the right of way to vehicular traffic proceeding through a green traffic signal;
- g. Failing to maintain proper distance between vehicles;
- h. Failing to have their vehicle under proper and adequate control;
- i. Operating their vehicle at a rate of speed that was dangerous and excessive under the circumstances;
- j. Violating the "assured clear distance ahead" rule;
- k. Driving Failure to apply their brakes earlier to stop their vehicle to avoid the subject red light crash;
- 1. Being inattentive to their duties as a driver;
- m. Failing to remain continually alert while operating said vehicle;
- n. Disregarding applicable traffic lanes, patterns, and devices;
- o. Failing to perceive the highly apparent danger to the motoring public, specifically including Plaintiff, which their actions and/or inactions posed;
- p. Failing to be highly vigilant and maintain sufficient control of said vehicle and to bring it to a stop on the shortest possible notice;
- q. Operating said vehicle with disregard for the rights of Plaintiff, even though they were aware or should have been aware of the presence of Plaintiff and the threat of harm posed to him/her;
- r. Continuing to operate their vehicle in a direction towards Plaintiff's vehicle when they saw, or in the exercise of reasonable diligence, should have seen, that further operation in that direction would result in a crash; and
- s. Failing to operate said package delivery van in compliance with applicable state and local laws and ordinances pertaining to the operation and control of motor vehicle including violations of Pennsylvania Motor Vehicle Code Sections 3111, 3112, 3310, 3361, 3714 and/or 3736.
- 13. As a direct and proximate result of the negligent and/or careless conduct of the tortfeasor, Plaintiff suffered various serious and permanent personal injuries, serious impairment

of bodily function and/or permanent serious disfigurement and/or aggravation of pre-existing conditions, including injuries to his left knee and left upper arm/shoulder, and lumbar/cervical strains/sprains, all to Plaintiff's great loss and detriment.

- 14. As a direct and proximate result of these injuries, all of which are permanent in nature and to Plaintiff's great financial detriment and loss, Plaintiff has in the past suffered, is presently suffering, and will in the future suffer great pain, anguish, sickness and agony.
- 15. As an additional direct and proximate result of the carelessness and/or negligence of the tortfeasor, along with the physical injuries suffered, Plaintiff has in the past suffered, is presently suffering, and will in the future suffer emotional injuries.
- 16. As a direct and proximate result of the negligent and/or careless conduct of the tortfeasor, Plaintiff suffered damage to Plaintiff's personal property, including the motor vehicle which Plaintiff was operating at the time of the aforesaid motor vehicle collision, including but not limited to, storage fees and towing, all to Plaintiff's great loss and detriment.
- 17. As a further direct and proximate result of Plaintiff's injuries, Plaintiff has in the past suffered, is presently suffering, and may in the future suffer a great loss of earnings and/or earning capacity, all to Plaintiff's further loss and detriment.
- 18. At the date and time of the subject crash, Plaintiff's vehicle was covered by a policy of insurance issued by Defendant under Policy Number 5837E967625 (the "Policy"), a copy of which is attached as **Ex. C**. The Policy included coverage for underinsured motorist ("UIM") coverage, applicable to Plaintiff, with limits of Fifty Thousand Dollars (\$50,000.00) per person.
- 19. Plaintiff initiated a lawsuit against the tortfeasor in Berks County on July 18, 2021, who was also insured by Nationwide with liability policy limits of Fifty Thousand Dollars (\$50,000.00) per person.

4

- 20. On November 16, 2021, Nationwide tendered the tortfeasor's Fifty Thousand Dollars (\$50,000.00) policy on November 16, 2021.
- 21. Given that the tortfeasor's insurance policy with Nationwide was insufficient to fully and adequately compensate Plaintiff for his injuries, expenses, and damages sustained in the subject crash, Plaintiff promptly made an initial informal claim upon Defendant for the full Fifty Thousand Dollar (\$50,000.00) UIM benefits available under the Policy, on November 12, 2021, and promptly provided additional documentation requested by Defendant over the following days.
- 22. On November 23, 2021, Plaintiff promptly made a formal claim upon Defendant for the full UIM benefits available under the Policy; Plaintiff included with that demand information and documentation supporting his claim to Defendant, specifically:
 - a. Police Crash Report;
 - b. June 16, 2020 Diagnostic Health MRI report;
 - c. St. Joseph Medical Center, Penn State Health records;
 - d. Delaware Valley Chiropractic and Rehabilitation records;
 - e. Regional and Spine Pain Care records:
 - f. 4/21/2021 Premier Pain Operative Report;
 - g. 5/24/2021 Lance Yarus Report; and
 - h. 6/29/21 BalaCare Solutions Life Care Plan Report presenting \$313,594.00 of future medical bills that plaintiff expects to incur.
- 23. Now, five (5) months after Plaintiff's demand for the full UIM benefits available under the Policy, Defendant has not responded to Plaintiff's formal demand, necessitating the filing of this action.

COUNT I Underinsured Motorists Coverage

24. Plaintiff incorporates by reference herein the allegations set forth in the above

paragraphs of this Complaint as if set forth herein at length.

- 25. At the time of the subject crash, the tortfeasor's motor vehicle/liability insurance policy, with limits of just Fifty Thousand Dollars (\$50,000.00), was insufficient to fully and adequately compensate Plaintiff for the injuries, expenses, and damages sustained in the subject crash.
- 26. Accordingly, Plaintiff asserts an Underinsured Motorist Claim under the Policy against Defendant, Nationwide.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, Angel Nazario, demands judgment in Plaintiff's favor and against Defendant, Nationwide Property and Casualty Insurance Company, in an amount in excess of Seventy-Five Thousand (\$75,000.00) Dollars, plus all costs and other relief this court deems necessary.

COUNT II Breach of Contract

- 27. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all previous allegations as if fully set forth herein at length.
- 28. The Policy issued by Defendant was valid and in force at the time of the subject crash, the policy provided UIM benefits with Fifty Thousand Dollars (\$50,000.00), Plaintiff's claim for coverage thereunder was timely made, less than one (1) week after resolving his claims under the tortfeasor's Nationwide insurance policy.
- 29. By failing to pay the full UIM benefits available under Plaintiff's Policy, now five (5) months after the demand was made, Nationwide has failed to comply with the terms of the Policy.
- 30. The Policy issued by Defendant includes an implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing.
 - 31. Defendant has to date failed to comply with the implied covenant of good faith and

fair dealing of the Policy.

- 32. Defendant breached the expressed and implied terms, provisions, promises and covenants of the Policy by, *inter alia*:
 - a. engaging in unfair or deceptive acts or practices;
 - b. failing to fully, fairly and promptly evaluate Plaintiff's UIM claim;
 - c. failing to offer a fair and reasonable amount of UIM benefits to Plaintiff to fully and fairly compensate him for his loss;
 - d. failing to make payment of the Policy coverage limits to Plaintiff;
 - e. failing to effectuate a prompt and fair settlement of Plaintiff's UIM claim;
 - f. failing to properly and fairly resolve Plaintiff's UIM claim;
 - g. failing to comply with the terms and provisions of the Policy;
 - h. breaching the implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing;
 - i. accepting premiums for UIM coverage while, at the same time, refusing to pay a reasonable and fair amount of UIM benefits to Plaintiff in violation of Pennsylvania law;
 - j. violating the Unfair Insurance Practices Act, 40 P.S. § 1171.1 et seq.;
 - k. acting in a dilatory and obdurate manner in the handling of Plaintiff's UIM claim;
 - 1. forcing Plaintiff to incur fees, costs and expenses in pursuing litigation in order to recover UIM benefits;
 - m. recklessly, wantonly, and/or willfully disregarding the rights of Plaintiff to recover the coverage limits of the Policy;
 - n. elevating its own interests above those of Plaintiff;
 - o. breaching the duty of good faith and fair dealing;
 - p. breaching the fiduciary duties owed to Plaintiff;
 - q. violating the statutes and regulations governing the actions and practices of insurers in Pennsylvania;
 - r. violating its own internal policies, procedures, practices and guidelines for the handling of UIM claims; and

- s. such other acts or omissions as may be developed during discovery.
- 33. Further, it is believed and averred that Defendant breached the expressed and implied terms, provisions, promises and covenants of the policy of insurance by, *inter alia*:
 - a. Having a pattern and practice of processing and evaluating the claims of Plaintiff, and other individuals represented by Simon & Simon, PC, based in whole or in part on the fact that Plaintiff was represented by Simon & Simon, PC, without regard to the facts, law and merits of individual claims;
 - b. Evaluating Plaintiff's claims based on the fact that he is represented by Simon & Simon, PC instead of on the merits of his individual case;
 - c. Failing to promptly investigate, process and satisfy Plaintiff's claims, in whole or in part, due to a pattern and practice of handling the claims of individuals represented by Simon & Simon, P.C. in a manner inconsistent with the duties of good faith and fair dealing;
 - d. Failing to reevaluate the value of Plaintiff's claim after being furnished with additional documents and information, and in the absence of any contrary medical evidence; and
 - e. Failing to make payment under the Policy for frivolous or unfounded reasons.
- 34. As a result of the breach of the expressed and implied terms, provisions, promises and covenants of the policy by Defendant, Plaintiff has been forced to incur fees, costs and expenses associated with the litigation of his claims.
- 35. Plaintiff is entitled to recover all direct and consequential damages arising from the breach of the expressed and implied terms, provisions, promises and covenants of the Policy by Defendant, including but not limited to:
 - a. counsel fees incurred in the instant bad faith litigation;
 - b. costs and expenses incurred in the instant bad faith litigation;
 - c. interest; and
 - d. such other relief as the Court deems appropriate.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, Angel Nazario, demands judgment in Plaintiff's favor and

against Defendant, Nationwide Property and Casualty Insurance Company, in an amount in excess of Seventy-Five Thousand (\$75,000.00) Dollars, plus all costs and other relief this court deems necessary.

COUNT III Rad Faith

- 36. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all previous allegations as if fully set forth herein at length.
 - 37. The Pennsylvania Bad Faith Statute, 42 Pa.C.S.A. § 8371, provides:

In an action arising under an insurer policy, if the court finds that the insurer has acted in bad faith toward the insured, the court may take all of the following actions:

- (1) Award interest on the amount of the claim from the date the claim was made by the insured in an amount equal to the prime rate of interest plus 3%.
- (2) Award punitive damages against the insurer.
- (3) Assess court costs and attorneys fees against the insurer.

42 Pa.C.S.A. § 8371.

- 38. Plaintiff's UIM claim constitutes an action arising under an insurance policy.
- 39. Defendant acted in bad faith and in violation of 42 Pa.C.S.A. § 8371 in failing to make payment of a fair and reasonable amount of UIM benefits to Plaintiff by, *inter alia*:
 - a. engaging in unfair or deceptive acts or practices;
 - b. failing to fully, fairly and promptly evaluate Plaintiff's UIM claim;
 - c. failing to offer a fair and reasonable amount of UIM benefits to Plaintiff to fully and fairly compensate him for his loss;
 - d. failing to make any offer of UIM benefits to Plaintiff;
 - e. failing to make payment of the Policy coverage limits to Plaintiff;
 - f. failing to effectuate a prompt and fair settlement of Plaintiff's UIM claim;

- g. failing to properly and fairly resolve Plaintiff's UIM claim;
- h. failing to comply with the terms and provisions of the Policy;
- i. breaching the implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing;
- accepting premiums for UIM coverage while, at the same time, refusing to pay a reasonable and fair amount of UIM benefits to Plaintiff in violation of Pennsylvania law;
- k. violating the Unfair Insurance Practices Act, 40 P.S. § 1171.1 et seq.;
- l. acting in a dilatory and obdurate manner in the handling of Plaintiff's UIM claim;
- m. forcing Plaintiff to incur fees, costs and expenses in pursuing litigation in order to recover UIM benefits;
- n. recklessly, wantonly, and/or willfully disregarding the rights of Plaintiff to recover the coverage limits of the Policy;
- o. elevating its own interests above those of Plaintiff;
- p. breaching the duty of good faith and fair dealing;
- q. breaching the fiduciary duties owed to Plaintiff;
- r. violating the statutes and regulations governing the actions and practices of insurers in Pennsylvania;
- s. violating its own internal policies, procedures, practices and guidelines for the handling of UIM claims; and
- t. such other acts or omissions as may be developed during discovery.
- 40. Further, it is believed and averred that Defendant breached the expressed and implied terms, provisions, promises and covenants of the policy of insurance by, *inter alia*:
 - a. Having a pattern and practice of processing and evaluating the claims of Plaintiff, and other individuals represented by Simon & Simon, PC, based in whole or in part on the fact that Plaintiff was represented by Simon & Simon, PC, without regard to the facts, law and merits of individual claims;
 - b. Evaluating Plaintiff's claims based on the fact that he is represented by Simon & Simon, PC instead of on the merits of her individual case;
 - c. Failing to promptly investigate, process and satisfy Plaintiff's claims, in whole or in part, due to a pattern and practice of handling the claims of individuals

Case 5:22-cv-01598-JFL Document 1 Filed 04/25/22 Page 14 of 14

represented by Simon & Simon, P.C. in a manner inconsistent with the duties of

good faith and fair dealing;

d. Failing to reevaluate the value of Plaintiff's claim after being furnished with additional documents and information, and in the absence of any contrary medical

evidence; and

e. Failing to make payment under the Policy for frivolous or unfounded reasons.

41. Defendant is liable for payment of interest, fees, costs and punitive damages to

Plaintiff for the bad faith conduct in handling and adjusting his UIM claim.

42. Defendant is liable for payment of all actual damages and consequential damages

to Plaintiff for the wanton, willful and reckless bad faith conduct in handling and refusing to fairly

adjust, evaluate and settle Plaintiff's UIM claim.

43. Defendant recklessly, wantonly, and/or willfully disregarded Plaintiff's rights,

forcing him to proceed with litigation in order to recover UIM benefits under the Policy, being

fully aware that the UIM claim had a value in excess of the available coverage limits.

44. Plaintiff, is entitled to recover counsel fees and costs from Defendant that he has

incurred in bringing and prosecuting the instant litigation.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, Angel Nazario, demands judgment in Plaintiff's favor and

against Defendant, Nationwide Property and Casualty Insurance Company, in an amount in excess

of Seventy-Five Thousand (\$75,000.00) Dollars, plus all costs and other relief this court deems

necessary.

SIMON & SIMON, P.C.

BY:

Marc Simon

Marc I. Simon, Esquire

Roman T. Galas, Esquire

11